5. A movement detector as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the cross-section of the mirror assembly forms a polygon.

6. A movement detector as claimed in claim 5, characterized in that the polygon is essentially a triangle.

9. A movement detector as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the sensor includes an infrared sensor.

10. A method of installing a movement detector in a space in order to detect movement of a body in the space, a light-sensitive sensor being arranged above a ceiling of the space while optical means are arranged in such a manner that they project a multiple image of the space onto the sensor, characterized in that the optical means include a mirror assembly having a kaleidoscopic effect, the arrangement being such that the mirror assembly extends essentially through the ceiling.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Keller ('688).

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 8 calling for the cross-section of the mirror assembly

varies from a smallest to a largest cross-section along its longitudinal axis, and claims 7 and 8 have been cancelled.

Keller discloses a movement detector including an optical system (one or more lenses), a radiation receiver and at least one internally reflecting prism surface between the lens and the detector. Keller teaches that in accordance with the principle of his invention the prism surface(s) must be arranged substantially axially parallel to the axis of the optical system (col. 2, lines 29-33; col. 5, lines 31-34).

Accordingly, Keller does not anticipate claim 1. As to the remaining dependent claims 3-6 and 9, these claims are likewise not anticipated by reason of their direct or indirect dependence on claim 1. Accordingly, it is felt that the rejection is in error and should be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being upnatentable over Keller in view of Chang.

The Examiner states that while Keller does not explicitly disclose a prism with a triangular cross-section, nevertheless, such a shape is well-known in the art. Furthermore, the Examiner states that Chang shows in a radiation detector.

Chang's radiation detector includes a radiation deflector 6 positioned between a cylindrical lens 3 and a sensor 5. The function of radiation deflector 6 is to direct laterally-incoming radiation (S3, S4) to the sensor 5. Nevertheless, radiation deflector 6 has no active surfaces which are either internally

reflecting or parallel to the optical axis 70 of lens 3. See, for example, Figs. 1, 2 and 4. In fact, surfaces 61 and 62 are externally reflecting.

As pointed out above, Keller teaches that his prism surface(s) must be both internally reflecting and axially parallel to the optical system axis. The skilled artisan would therefore view the teachings of Keller and Chang to be in conflict, and would not combine them in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Thus, claim 1, which now incorporates the limitations of claim 8, and claim 6, which depends on claim 1, would not be obvious in view of the combination of Keller and Chang.

Accordingly it is felt that claims 1 and 6 are patentable over the combination of Keller and Chang, and it is urged that the rejection is in error and should be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller in view of Yung ('203).

The Examiner acknowledges that there is no teaching by Yung that the housing can be adjusted so that any portion of the detection structure would extend through the ceiling, nevertheless maintaining that it would be obvious to do so.

However, there is no suggestion by Yung that such an adjustment could be made or would be at all desirable. Absent any other piece of prior art providing such a suggestion, the Examiner has failed to make out a prima facie case of obviousness, and the hindsight gained from Applicant's own teachings cannot be relied upon to provide such a case.

Accordingly, it is felt that claim 10 is patentable over the combination of Keller and Yung, and it is urged that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above arguments and amendments, it is felt that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

John C Fox

John C. Fox, Reg. 24,975
Consulting Patent Attorney

APPENDIX

MARKED-UP AMENDED CLAIM:

1. A movement detector which is capable of detecting movement of a body in a space and includes a light-sensitive sensor and optical means which are capable of projecting a multiple image of the space onto the sensor, ~~characterized in that~~ the optical means ~~include~~ including a mirror assembly, the mirror assembly constituting an elongate body whose reflecting surface faces inwards, the mirror assembly having a kaleidoscopic effect, characterized in that the cross-section of the mirror assembly varies from a smallest to a largest cross-section along its longitudinal axis.